ORGANIZATION CRITERIA

Organization Profile						
Organiza	tion General					
• Relatio	nship of mission and goals to propose	d service(s)				
History	of providing proposed service(s) or sin	milar service(s)				
• Numbe	Number and qualifications of independent governing board members					
• Ratio o	Ratio of Columbia residents on governing board					
Dating	3	2	1			
Rating:	High	Moderate	Limited			
Organiza	Organization Financial					
• Financi	Financial statement					
Financial procedures including board oversight						
Level of other sources of funding						
 Ratio of management and fundraising expenses to program expenses 						
• Level of reserve funds						
Employee compensation levels						
Pating:	3	2	1			
raung:	High Moderate Limited					

3-High	High level of capacity
2-Moderate	Moderate level of capacity
1-Limited	Limited level of capacity

PROGRAM CRITERIA

Program Overview form				
Statement of the Issue Being Addressed				
Relevancy of issue to be addressed to the issue identified in RFP				
Use of data to describe the issue				
Use of data to describe the population affected by the issue				
Use of data to describe the effect of the issue on Columbia, MO				
4	3	2	1	
Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Program Consumers				
Use of data to describe the program consumers				
Rationale for the target program consumers				
Relevance of target population to RFP				
Total number of individuals to be served				
Total cost per individual served				
4	3	2	1	
Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
	nt of the Issue Being Address ancy of issue to be addressed data to describe the issue data to describe the populat data to describe the effect o 4 Excellent Consumers data to describe the program conce of target population to Rumber of individuals to be seed to set per individual served	tof the Issue Being Addressed acy of issue to be addressed to the issue identified in RFP data to describe the issue data to describe the population affected by the issue data to describe the effect of the issue on Columbia, MO 4 5 Excellent Consumers data to describe the program consumers alle for the target program consumers ance of target population to RFP cumber of individuals to be served out per individual served 4 3 Excellent 3 Excellent 4 3 Excellent 4 3 Excellent 3 Excellent 4 3 Excellent 3 Excellent 4 3 Excellent 4 3 Excellent 4 3 Excellent 4 3 Excellent 3 Excellent 4 3	tof the Issue Being Addressed acy of issue to be addressed to the issue identified in RFP data to describe the issue data to describe the population affected by the issue data to describe the effect of the issue on Columbia, MO 4 3 2 Excellent Good Fair Consumers data to describe the program consumers alle for the target program consumers ace of target population to RFP umber of individuals to be served ast per individual served 4 3 2	

PROGRAM CRITERIA (cont'd.)

og. a.	m Overview form (con	t'd.)		
Program				
• Relevar	nce of stated goal(s) to organ	nization's goal(s), the issue(s) to	be addressed, and progr	am consumers
Rating:	4	3	2	1
_	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
	Description			
•	tion of the proposed progra			
Relevar		the issue identified in the RFP		<u> </u>
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Cood	2	1
Duagua		Good	Fair	Poor
Program A				
_	m location and hours of servi		rogram and DED	
	n cost to consumer	iteria to target population of pr	Ogram and KFP	
FIUGIAL	4	3	2	1
Rating:	Excellent	Good	Z Fair	Poor
Program		Good	ı alı	F 001
 Presence Level of Utilizati Utilizati Rating: Program Program Prograr Prograr 	h of evidence to support the ce of innovative policies and f partnership and collaborati ion and strength of quality ir ion of consumer feedback in 4 Excellent Personnel m personnel qualifications m staffing levels m personnel compensation le	practices on mprovement process quality improvement process 3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
 Presence Level of Utilizati Utilizati Rating: Program Program Prograr Prograr Prograr Prograr 	ce of innovative policies and f partnership and collaboration and strength of quality ir ion of consumer feedback in 4 Excellent Personnel m personnel qualifications m staffing levels m personnel compensation leads	practices on mprovement process quality improvement process 3 Good		
 Presence Level of Utilizati Utilizati Rating: Program Program Prograr Prograr Prograr Prograr 	ce of innovative policies and f partnership and collaboration and strength of quality ir ion of consumer feedback in 4 Excellent Personnel m personnel qualifications m staffing levels m personnel compensation levels	practices on mprovement process quality improvement process 3 Good	Fair	Poor
 Presence Level of Utilizati Utilizati Rating: Program 	ce of innovative policies and f partnership and collaboration and strength of quality ir ion of consumer feedback in 4 Excellent Personnel m personnel qualifications m staffing levels m personnel compensation leading to the staffing levels Excellent 4 Excellent Service Need	practices on mprovement process quality improvement process 3 Good evels 3 Good	Fair 2	Poor 1
 Presence Level of Utilizati Utilizati Rating: Program 	ce of innovative policies and f partnership and collaborati ion and strength of quality ir ion of consumer feedback in 4 Excellent Personnel m personnel qualifications m staffing levels m personnel compensation leads to the	practices on mprovement process quality improvement process 3 Good evels 3 Good	Fair 2	Poor 1
 Presence Level of Utilizati Utilizati Rating: Program Program Prograr Prograr Rating: Program Statem 	ce of innovative policies and f partnership and collaboration and strength of quality ir ion of consumer feedback in 4 Excellent Personnel m personnel qualifications m staffing levels m personnel compensation leading to the staffing levels Excellent 4 Excellent Service Need	practices on mprovement process quality improvement process 3 Good evels 3 Good	Fair 2	Poor 1
 Presence Level of Utilizati Utilizati Rating: Program Program Program Program Program Statem Rating: 	ce of innovative policies and f partnership and collaborati ion and strength of quality ir ion of consumer feedback in 4 Excellent Personnel m personnel qualifications m staffing levels m personnel compensation leads to be excellent 4 Excellent Service Need ent of service need in Column	practices on mprovement process quality improvement process 3 Good evels 3 Good bia, MO 3	Fair 2 Fair	Poor 1 Poor
 Presence Level of Utilizati Utilizati Rating: Program Program Program Program Program Statem Rating: Citations Adhere Approp 	ce of innovative policies and f partnership and collaborati ion and strength of quality ir ion of consumer feedback in 4 Excellent Personnel m personnel qualifications m staffing levels m personnel compensation leads to be excellent 4 Excellent Service Need ent of service need in Column	practices on mprovement process quality improvement process 3 Good evels 3 Good bia, MO 3 Good hodology	Fair 2 Fair	Poor 1 Poor
 Presence Level of Utilizati Utilizati Rating: Program Program Program Program Program Statem Rating: Citations Adhere Approp 	ce of innovative policies and f partnership and collaboration and strength of quality ir ion of consumer feedback in 4 Excellent Personnel m personnel qualifications m staffing levels m personnel compensation leaders and excellent Service Need ent of service need in Columnate of the columnate	practices on mprovement process quality improvement process 3 Good evels 3 Good bia, MO 3 Good hodology	Fair 2 Fair	Poor 1 Poor

PROGRAM CRITERIA (cont'd.)

Program Budget form Level of detail in budget narrative Adequacy of overall program funding

Ratio of City of Columbia funding to other sources of funding

Program Service form

Correlation between program expenses and program description/services/performance measures
 Rating:
 4
 5
 6
 7
 7
 8
 7
 9
 9
 1
 9
 9

Consumer Demographics form				
• Reflect	ion of description of progran	n consumers		
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor

Program Service(s) • Unit of service rate (cost) • Amount of service • Number of individuals to be served • Average units of service per individual • Average cost per individual • Utilization of available third party payer sources 3 2 1 Rating: Excellent Good Fair Poor **Funding Request Justification** • Justification for level of funding from the City of Columbia • Basis for funding request from the City of Columbia 3 2 1 Rating: Excellent Good Fair Poor

Program Performance Measures form				
 Relatio 	nship of outcome(s) to progr	ram goal(s) and issue identifi	ed in RFP	
• Relativ	ity and feasibility of outcome	e indicator(s)		
• Relativ	ity, validity, and reliability of	the method(s) of measurem	ent	
Dating	4	3	2	1
Rating:	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor

4-Excellent	Exceptionally well-conceived and thoroughly developed response to the given question.
	Content resonates deeply with the expectations and impact goals of the RFP.
3-Good	Response is largely relevant, sufficient, and appropriate to address the criterion,
	although some minor inconsistencies or weaknesses may remain.
2-Fair	Response pertains in some intelligible and useful way to the stated criterion, but
	otherwise is significantly unclear, inaccurate, incomplete, inconsistent, or irrelevant.
1-Poor	Does not meet minimal standards. Response is prohibitively unclear, inaccurate,
	incomplete, inconsistent, irrelevant to the stated criterion, or otherwise exhibits a clear
	conflict with the goals of the RFP.